



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,777	10/17/2003	Philippe Barre	402842/WEINSTEIN	7736

23548 7590 01/11/2005
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
700 THIRTEENTH ST. NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3960

EXAMINER

YAN, REN LUO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2854

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/686,777

Applicant(s)

BARRE ET AL

Examiner

Ren L Yan

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4-28-2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 20, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bresson et al(5,352,507). The patent to Bresson et al teaches a seamless multilayered printing sleeve as claimed including a printing layer 6, a compressible layer 4 and a circumferential stiffening layer 5 disposed between the printing layer 6 and the compressible layer 4. The stiffening layer 5 functions as a reinforcing layer placed on the compressible layer and is made of fibrous polymer oriented circumferentially as shown in Fig. 11. See the entire Bresson patent for details. Regarding claims 2 and 20, the broadly recited removal facilitating layer reads on layers 9, 10, or the polymeric release sheet described in column 12, lines 14-26 in Bresson et al. Regarding claim 7, see column 6, lines 7-59 in Bresson et al. Regarding claim 8, Bresson teaches in column 8, lines 9-24 that the reinforcing layers 7 and 7a could have a thickness of about 0.1 to 0.5mm. Regarding claims 10, 12 and 13, Bresson et al in column 11, lines 64-66 require the modulus of elasticity of the reinforcing layer 5 to be at least 200 Mpa. Regarding claim 22, Bresson teaches in column 9, lines 38-48 that the removal facilitating layer(carrier tube 10) is made of a heat-shrinkable material.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2854

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 9, 11, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bresson et al. With respect to claim 6, Bresson may not state the wt% of the reinforcing layer and the reinforcing elements. However, from Fig. 11 of Bresson, it would appear that the 20-80wt% of the reinforcing layer and elements are most likely met by the teaching of Bresson. Nevertheless, in order for the reinforcing layer to be effective in preventing bulges and undulations in compressible foam layers during operation, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to determine the proper wt% of the reinforcing layer and the reinforcing elements based upon routine experimentations in order to achieve this objective. Such a determination by those skilled in the art through routine experimentations would have been most obvious. Regarding claim 9, Bresson clearly teaches the desire to have the modulus of elasticity of the reinforcing layer 5 set to be at least 200 Mpa. In view of this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to increase the modulus of elasticity of the reinforcing layer to be 400 Mpa as recited if experimentations indicate that printing quality would be improved at a high modulus of elasticity. Regarding claim 11, Bresson did not give the elongation at breakage tolerance percentage for the reinforcing layer. It is noted that the elongation at breakage for the reinforcing layer to be at greater than 1.2% is fairly small. The reinforcing layer of Bresson would most likely possess this property since the printing sleeve of Bresson would undergo an expansion in a circumferential direction upon being mounted onto or demounted from a printing cylinder. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to determine the elongation at

Art Unit: 2854

breakage tolerance of the reinforcing layer through routine experimentations in order for the printing sleeve to work properly as intended and such a determination would have been obvious.

With respect to claims 25 and 26, Bresson teaches all that is claimed except for the thickness range, the surface Ra factor and the friction of coefficient of the removal facilitating layer. It should be apparent to those having ordinary skill in the art that the thickness range, the surface Ra factor and the friction of coefficient of the removal facilitating layer of the printing sleeve are selected for the removal facilitating layer to achieve its optimal performance during the printing sleeve mounting and demounting operations. It would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to determine those variables through routine experimentations.

Claims 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bresson et al in view of Castelli et al(5,754,931). Bresson et al teach all that is claimed except for the use of microspheres in the compressible layer. Castelli et al teach in a printing blanket the conventionality of using microspheres that undergo a thermal expansion to form a compressible layer in the printing blanket. See column 3, line 64 through column 4, line 51 in Castelli et al for example. In view of the teaching of Castelli et al, it would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the printing sleeve of Bresson et al with a compressible layer made of microspheres in order to achieve increased compressibility of the compressible layer.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bresson et al in view of Kia et al(6,699,419). Bresson et al teach all that is claimed except for the use of a gel coat to produce the removal facilitating layer. Kia et al teach in a molding process the conventional use of a mold release agent on the surface of the mold and a gel coat layer is applied onto the dried surface of the mold so as to facilitate the removal of the molded object.

Art Unit: 2854

See column 4, lines 27-42 in Kia et al for example. It would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the printing sleeve of Bresson et al with the release agent and the gel coat layer as taught by Kia et al so as to facilitate the mounting and demounting of the printing sleeve with respect to the printing cylinder.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bresson et al in view of Asai et al(2002/0182328). Bresson et al teach all that is claimed except for the use of an electrostatically applied layer of powder to produce the removal facilitating layer. Asai et al teach in a process of making a sleeve the conventional use of fluoropolymer powders electrostatically coated and baked to form a smooth release resin layer for the sleeve. See [0041] in Asai et al for example. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the printing sleeve of Bresson et al with the electrostatically coated powder layer to function as the removal facilitating layer so as to facilitate the mounting and demounting of the printing sleeve.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bresson et al in view of Duckett et al(4,061,818). Bresson et al teach all that is claimed except that the thickness of the printing layer is not disclosed. Duckett et al teach a printing blanket having a printing layer 13 with a thickness ranging between 0.012 inch and 0.15 inch which is less than 0.5 mm as recited. In view of the teaching of Duckett et al, it would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the printing sleeve of Bresson et al with a printing layer having a thickness of less than 0.5 mm since it is a well known thickness for a printing layer to ensure proper printing operations.

Art Unit: 2854

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ren L Yan whose telephone number is 571-272-2173. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on 571-272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Ren L Yan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2854

Ren Yan
Jan. 7, 2005